

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Monday, June 13, 2005 – 9:00 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Michael Johnson, Co-Chair,
Phoenix

Ed Beasley, Co-Chair, Glendale, representing
the MAG Management Committee

Larry Shobe, Tempe, representing the
MAG Street Committee

Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing the
American Society of Landscape Architects,
Arizona Chapter

Robert Schultz, City of Mesa, representing
the Arts Community

Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale, representing the
MAG Pedestrian Working Group

*Andre Licardi, Arizona Commission of the
Arts

Bill Lazenby, representing the MAG Regional
Bicycle Task Force

Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation Foundation,
representing the Archaeological and
Historic Preservation Community

* Not Present

OTHERS PRESENT

Ken Hall, MAG

Tom Remes, MAG

Lon McDermott, Town of Wickenburg

Steve McKay, Town of Wickenburg

Eric Iwersen, Tempe

Scott Cisson, Arizona State University

Tim Quinn, City of Glendale

Mark Young, Town of Queen Creek

Linda Snidecor, City of Goodyear

Peggy Rubach, MCDOT

Cristina Herrera, MCDOT

Mitch Foy, City of Mesa

Melinda Brimhall, City of Chandler

Mike Normand, City of Chandler

Tami Ryall, Town of Gilbert

Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix

Art MacFarland, Procon Cycling

Marty Long, Procon Cycling

Paula Moloff, City of Glendale

Patrick Panetta, Arizona State University

Gerard Prosnier, Procon Cycling

Sintra Hoffman, City of Surprise

Diane Brossart, Valley Forward

Theresa Sanders, Valley Forward

Tom Culp, BAS Cycle

Ian Cordwell, Town of Cave Creek

Arthur Wirtz, Tonto National Forest

Marty Long, Mesa

Janeen Gaskins, City of Avondale

Jeff Sherman, Sherman Group

Diane Nakagawa, City of Phoenix

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Michael Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. Approval of the December 10, 2004 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Addressing the first order of business, Co-Chair Johnson asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and asked for a formal approval. Mr. Doug Kupel moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Bill Lazenby seconded, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Working Group.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson asked members of the Working Group, and those individuals who were in attendance to introduce themselves.

4. Call to the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson asked if there were any comments from the public. He informed those in attendance that there were two versions of Request to Speak cards. Co-Chair Johnson noted that the blue cards were for individuals that wished to speak on items not related to items on the agenda, whereas the yellow cards were required to provide public input on items that were specifically related to the agenda. When addressing the application process, he asked all presenters, and members who were in attendance to speak on behalf of a project, to fill out a yellow card. Co-Chair Johnson then stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience for non-agenda items, and moved on to the next item.

5. Staff Report

Co-Chair Johnson introduced Mr. Ken Hall, MAG Transportation Planner, to provide an update on current items of interest. Mr. Hall informed those in attendance that on January 11, 2005, the ADOT Transportation Enhancement Review Committee (TERC) met to take action on a number of policy issues. Mr. Hall stated that at the January meeting, ADOT Staff informed the TERC that Category #3 (Acquisition of Scenic easements or Historic sites) was no longer an eligible activity within Arizona, due to a number of private land issues that were of concern to the State Transportation Board. He also stated that the TERC recommended reducing the State Funding Category from a maximum limit of \$1.5 million down to \$1.0 million. Mr. Hall stated that other TERC Committee actions included limiting the number of applications at the regional level; removing size restrictions for trees within the application; adopting new application review criteria at the state level, resulting in revised

project ranking forms; and not allowing regional representatives to use PowerPoint presentations at their annual meeting in October. Mr. Hall also informed the Working Group that the TERC changed their voting policies, and is now allowing each rural Council of Governments to vote on all project applications. He discussed the TERC's alternate voting policy, and then presented a slide of all organizations and positions that currently have a vote on the TERC. Mr. Hall also informed members of the Group that a handout was distributed prior to the meeting, which indicates all current voting representatives.

Mr. Hall then provided a brief overview of funding from last year's Round XII. He stated that during Round XII, there were a total of 49 Local project submittals, which totaled \$20,592,531 in overall requests. Of this amount, \$5.8 million, or 28 percent of the total amount was approved. He then informed those in attendance that there were a total of 26 State project submittals, which totaled \$16,460,233 in overall requests. Of this amount, \$3.2 Million, or 20 percent of the total amount was approved. Mr. Hall stated that the process was extremely competitive, and only about \$9 million was awarded to 75 applicants throughout Arizona. Mr. Hall then provided an overview of State and Local Round XII projects by agency. He noted that while the MAG Region did very well in the Local project category and received most of Arizona's funding at approximately \$1.8 million, MAG was not able to obtain funding from the State Funding Category for the region's three project submittals.

Mr. Hall then provided a brief overview of overall Transportation Enhancement funding by agency during the most recent round occurring in 2004, and provided information of how MAG projects were ranked in comparison with other applicants throughout the state. He noted that there were a total of five projects from last year that have been resubmitted for consideration at today's meeting, which included the Town of Cave Creek (The Walk); the City of Tempe (Crosscut Canal II); Arizona State University Polytechnic (Backus Mall), which is re-submitting this year in joint partnership with the City of Mesa; the City of Chandler (Bike Lanes); and the Town of Wickenburg (Multi-Use Path). There were no questions from the Working Group, and this concluded Mr. Hall's report.

6. Review and Discussion of Round XIII Enhancement Fund Applications

Addressing the next order of business, Co-Chair Johnson thanked those in attendance for participating in today's meeting, and described the process for hearing each of the applications. Co-Chair Johnson informed the Working Group that a total of five minutes would be allowed for each presentation, which would be followed by a five minute public comment period, and a maximum, ten-minute time frame to allow the Working Group to ask questions and to make necessary comments. Co-Chair Johnson noted that it was very important to maintain structured time limitations in accordance with the Working Group's adopted Review Policy. Mr. Hall then addressed the Working Group, and stated that the primary goal of today's meeting was to assist applicants in submitting high-quality applications that have the ability to compete for funding against application submittals at the state level. Mr. Hall then provided information on the process, and informed those in attendance that he would introduce each project "in order" as identified within the Agenda.

Mr. Hall also informed those in attendance that applicants will be required to submit a written response to comments and questions raised by members of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group prior to the next meeting, which is scheduled for June 23, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. in the MAG Cholla Conference Room. Co-Chair Johnson addressed the Working Group and thanked them for attending, and stated that their work in this effort was greatly appreciated. He asked if there were any questions, and then proceeded to the application review process for the projects identified below, which were heard by the Working Group in order.

Town of Wickenburg - Downtown Street Scape Project (US 60 and US 93)

Mr. Lon McDermott addressed the Working Group and stated that in 2008, ADOT will construct a US 93 bypass around downtown Wickenburg. Because of the new bypass, the town is challenged with renovating its historic downtown area, which was devastated by excessive heavy truck traffic over the years. The community is positioning itself to once again become the “Old West” destination point that it used to be in the past, and wants to establish the downtown as a pedestrian-friendly area. He stated that Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds would complete the Downtown Streetscape Plan, which was developed in 2004 by the Tempe consulting firm of Logan Simpson Design. Mr. McDermott highlighted the central components of the project, which included the conversion of a 1962 bridge across the Hassayampa River into a pedestrian walkway, and the renovation of a railroad underpass on US 60.

Mr. McDermott noted that the Town of Wickenburg has a relatively small tax base with little resources. He said that the award of this particular project would have a significant impact on the community. Mr. McDermott addressed floods on the Hassayampa River; described the location of the site in downtown Wickenburg; and stated that the future bypass around Wickenburg will not only deter commercial vehicles from using downtown, but may also reduce the number of light vehicles that would otherwise use the downtown area. He stressed the importance of the project and how it would contribute to the revitalization of downtown by creating a pedestrian friendly area and attracting non-commercial vehicles into the downtown area.

Ms. Angela Dye addressed the project, and informed the Working Group that one of the primary objectives of today’s meeting is to make the applications more competitive. She wanted to stress the fact that comments made at the meeting are not intended to be critical, but should rather be interpreted by the applicants as being constructive in nature. She addressed Mr. McDermott, and stated that the graphics in the application need some work. The labeling was unclear, and there was some confusion on directions and orientation on the graphics. Ms. Dye observed that the Town checked the “Historic Preservation” box in Item #9 of the application, but she did not see the historic component identified in the narrative or on the maps. She asked where the historic area was on the map, and specifically how it relates to the application. Ms. Dye also asked for clarification on the widths of sidewalks, and the provision of ADA ramps. She also noted that it would be helpful to show the connectivity to the downtown area.

Ms. Dawn Coomer then addressed Question #10 of the application. She said that it would be a good idea to add clarification to #10, and said that there should be more narrative on specific project components, such as the width and length of the walkway; whether there will be landscaping; and what major work needs to be done at the bridge. She also noted that it would be helpful to address existing conditions of the area, and to address the economic and social benefits of the project to the area. Ms. Coomer also addressed the cost estimates that were provided in the application. She suggested that these items should be condensed into the provided Cost Estimate form in the application, opposed to itemizing a separate list. She inquired about the photos at the back of the application, and asked whether one of the bridges was going to be demolished. She noted that an applicant cannot demolish a bridge with Federal funds, and Mr. McDermott said that ADOT would be completing the demolition. Mr. McDermott thanked Ms. Coomer for her comments.

Mr. Doug Kupel addressed Item #9 in the application, and said that two items were circled. He noted that applicants should only circle the primary category. Mr. Kupel said that the project would not be eligible for funding under Item #7, and asked Mr. McDermott to check with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine if the facilities are eligible. Mr. Doug Kupel then addressed Item #16 of the application, and said that the way the item was written, it sounded more like an entitlement. He noted that it should be written in a manner which may cause readers, or reviewers to be more receptive, and reward the project in a positive manner.

Town of Wickenburg - US 60 Multi - Use Path

Mr. Steve McKay addressed the working group, and stated that the project specifically involved the construction of a 10' wide, multi-use path within the right-of-way of US 60. Mr. McKay said that the project was located within the Town of Wickenburg, and would extend a distance of approximately 1.4 miles from the Vulture Mine Crossing to Los Altos Drive. He noted that this would be Stage II of a previously funded project extending from Sunset Park to the Vulture Mine Crossing. Mr. McKay said that this project would complete the town's multi-use path from the Town Core to Sunset Park. He noted that the project would be constructed at a minimum distance of 25' away from US 60, and would be located in an area containing open desert with panoramic views and native vegetation. The new multi-use path would be friendly toward pedestrians and family, and also allow for a connection to Wickenburg High School through Vulture Mine Road.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Bill Lazenby asked whether there is a problem with the bike lane not being wide enough, and inquired about signage. Mr. McKay stated that the width of the path was sufficient, and that there would not be any problems associated with the pathway. McKay also provided clarification on the pathway's width of 10 feet. Mr. Kupel called attention to Item #10, and said that the word "Scoping" was misspelled. He also asked for clarification on the low-water crossings.

Town of Gilbert - Gilbert Heritage District Downtown Pedestrian Project

Ms. Tami Ryall addressed the Working Group, and provided a general overview of the Gilbert Heritage District. Ms. Ryall stated that the proposed project involves the installation of sidewalks in the area to allow for connectivity between downtown destinations, and to modify existing facilities to meet ADA requirements. Ms. Ryall addressed current land uses and project needs affiliated with the area. She stressed that the downtown's sidewalk system is seriously inadequate and does not allow for connectivity, as many are disconnected and contain gaps. Ms. Ryall addressed a number of safety concerns with children and seniors, and provided photos citing examples of ADA and connectivity problems associated with the existing downtown sidewalk network. She noted that the downtown area of the Town of Gilbert was a high-use pedestrian area, and that funding of the project would address safety concerns, and promote a pedestrian-friendly area.

Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that she liked the photos, and commented on how some of the application seemed a little vague with respect to the sidewalk network. She said that it may be beneficial to identify the specific areas containing gaps in the system, and that the town may want to consider including demographic information describing low-to-moderate income and elderly populations. Mr. Larry Shobe asked Ms. Ryall for clarification on curbs and sidewalks, and issues pertaining to right-of-way. Mr. Doug Kupel then addressed the Working Group, and called their attention to Item #10 in the application. He noted that the narrative stated the area contained a total of 52 acres. Mr. Kupel suggested that the it may be more beneficial to look at specific project areas within the larger project area, and to reduce the sites down to identified subareas - and to also include any relevant maps. Mr. Kupel asked whether the area met any historic preservation criteria, and suggested that the Town conduct a historic survey of the area. Mr. Kupel noted that this could be done through SHPO. After further discussion, Ms. Ryall stated that the area was not necessarily historic, but essentially just a neglected area of mixed uses and residential neighborhoods.

City of Scottsdale - Thomas Road Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalk Enhancement Project 64th to 68th Street

Mr. Reed Kempton addressed the Working Group and stated that the project involves the addition of bicycle lanes, and enhancing sidewalks along Thomas Road from 64th Street to 68th Street. Mr. Kempton stated that the project is about a half-mile long, and that the project would provide linkages to bike lanes and routes, housing, neighborhood businesses, and also connect to the Crosscut Canal and the Papago Salado Trail. Mr. Kempton then provided information on project costs and displayed several pictures of the project area. He noted that this particular section of Thomas Road currently maintains a daily vehicle count of approximately 35,000 vehicles per day, and that there were specific safety issues pertaining to pedestrian mobility along the arterial. Mr. Kempton stated that east of 64th Street, the existing utility poles made the sidewalks too narrow for wheelchair access. Through a number of photos, Mr. Kempton demonstrated that much of the area currently has five-foot sidewalks adjacent to the curb, thereby creating insufficient queuing areas for pedestrians at some intersections. He also stated that sidewalks and ramps do not meet current universal

design standards, and that many of the area's driveway access points could be eliminated in order to enhance pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Angela Dye asked for clarification on pedestrian lighting within the project application. Mr. Kempton stated that the existing light poles are far apart from one another, and that the City of Scottsdale wanted to add others in the future. Mr. Bill Lazenby then asked for clarification on the bicycle lanes, and the potential need for additional right-of-way on the project. There were questions pertaining to which side of the roadway would actually contain the enhanced walkways. It was also brought to Mr. Kempton's attention that within the application, as part of Item #15, there were two periods after a sentence on Page Four.

City of Scottsdale – Crosscut Canal Multi-Use Path

Mr. Reed Kempton addressed the Crosscut Canal Multi-Use Path project, and stated that the project includes the design and construction of a 10 to 12-foot wide multi-use path along the east canal bank of the canal from Thomas Road to Indian School Road. Mr. Kempton stated that the project area was approximately 0.75 miles long, and enhances the Papago Salado Loop by connecting the Arizona Canal, and the cities of Phoenix and Tempe. Mr. Kempton also noted that the proposed project connects to numerous neighborhoods and businesses. He provided a number of project photos pertaining to the proposed site, and noted that the new path will be located on the east canal bank. Mr. Kempton said that it was not practical to locate the project on the west canal bank, and noted that an area of historic trees, and power lines at Thomas Road would prevent widening of the sidewalks beyond five feet in width. Mr. Kempton also addressed a project bridge component at Osborn Road. Mr. Kempton said that this was an important connection, and he had several letters of support from Papago Salado, with six others to follow.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Robert Schultz commented on whether there were any aesthetic enhancements planned for the project, and stated that they should be included in the narrative. Mr. Kempton agreed, and noted that there were artistic elements associated with the project. Mr. Doug Kupel then asked whether the area of trees at Osborn were considered historic in nature, and suggested that this could be identified through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Ms. Angela Dye noted that the trees could in fact be considered part of the historic landscape, and that there may be a way to designate them as historic. Mr. Kupel suggested that Mr. Kempton could check with the Salt River Project to see if this section has been evaluated.

Mr. Larry Shobe asked whether there was a connection to the project at Indian School Road, and addressed the issue of a signalized crossing at Thomas Road. Discussion followed, and there was a question pertaining to the bridge crossing. It was noted that more clarification was needed in the narrative to address the bridges. Discussion continued, and Co-Chair Johnson asked about the priority of the two Scottsdale project submittals. Mr. Reed Kempton said that while both projects were of importance, the City of Scottsdale would prefer the Crosscut Canal Multi-Use Path as the higher priority. Co-Chair Johnson also asked several questions about maintenance of the trail, and Mr. Kempton informed the

Working Group that this would be the sole responsibility of the City of Scottsdale.

City of Goodyear - Goodyear Pedestrian Project

Ms. Linda Snidecor addressed the Working Group, and stated that the project calls for the construction of a 10-foot wide pedestrian bridge over an overflow canal, which would connect the three pedestrian areas of St. Thomas Aquinas Catholic Community and school, the new YMCA pool, and the newly-opened Goodyear Community Park. Ms. Snidecor displayed a map showing the primary areas of development surrounding the project site. She emphasized the importance that the bridge would have on pedestrian connectivity at the site, and also provided an overview of a site plan for the area encompassing the Goodyear Community Park, the YMCA and St. Thomas Aquinas. Ms. Snidecor displayed a conceptualization of the pedestrian bridge, which included a blueprint of the bridge plan. Ms. Snidecor then displayed a series of photos that showed connectivity with the site, and also how the bridge would connect to an existing path. Ms. Snidecor emphasized the fact that there are development pressures in the area, and that the project would provide a safe passage for children using the YMCA, park and church. She also noted that the project would serve additional populations, create an alternate route of travel, and provide needed connectivity at the site.

Mr. Larry Shobe asked Ms. Snidecor for clarification on the bridge and overflow canal site. Ms. Snidecor stated that children are not advised to cross the overflow canal area, and that a new bridge is needed. She informed the Working Group that the bridge is located about 800 feet north of Thomas Road. Ms. Snidecor addressed several questions pertaining to the bridge's conceptual design. Co-Chair Beasley asked whether the YMCA, the church and the business community will partner to provide maintenance on the project. Ms. Snidecor said that the project site would be maintained by the City of Goodyear.

Further discussion followed, and Ms. Dawn Coomer noted that under Item #11.b of the application, the city needed to change this item from a "No" over to a "Yes." Ms. Coomer stated that the TERC would not approve this application as it now stands, because a project is required to be located along a transportation corridor. Ms. Coomer suggested that if the site will generate a high level of pedestrian usage at the bridge, then these points should be included in the narrative. Ms. Coomer also suggested that the City of Goodyear actively involve an artist in the design of the bridge project. Mr. Doug Kupel addressed Ms. Snidecor and the Working Group, and stated that he was not sure whether this project is on a transportation corridor. Mr. Kupel said that this project in particular was not a good candidate for transportation funding, because there is a church and a YMCA involved and that it appears to be a localized project issue. Mr. Kupel did not consider this to be a transportation enhancement project, and believes that individuals on the State TERC may have a similar reaction. Ms. Snidecor summarized her presentation, and stressed that the project provided a high level of connectivity for the area, and is in fact a transportation-oriented project.

City of Mesa - The Skyline Bike and Pedestrian Bridge

Mr. Mitchell Foy addressed the Working Group and provided a map of the project site. He informed those in attendance that the project connects the Skyline High School, Mesa Vista School, Dwight Patterson Elementary School, several churches, and the Skyline Park activity centers. The proposed pathway would also provide access to the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) power easement, the Central Arizona Project (CAP) and Pueblo Avenue, to allow for additional connectivity to remote destinations through the area. Mr. Foy provided a series of location maps, and displayed photos on the Skyline Bike and Pedestrian Pathway. He stated that the pathway begins at the west end of the project where the entrance to Skyline High School intersects Crismon Road, and travels to the drainage channel to the east. Mr. Foy addressed the future bridge over the drainage channel, and said that the project would have a tremendous impact on the area by providing connectivity to the school and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Angela Dye asked Mr. Foy if public input was received on the project. Mr. Foy stated that to date, there has not been any public input on this project. However, Mr. Foy stated that the city will be meeting with members of the community. Ms. Dye suggested that if the application included the public process within the narrative, it would strengthen the application. She also asked for clarification on the width of the sidewalk.

Mr. Doug Kupel called the Working Group's attention to Page 10. Mr. Kupel suggested that the arrows on the map need to actually point to the road, and also needed to include arrows on the east-west roads as well. He addressed the map on the bottom of the page, and stated that the map had two Broadway Road labels, and one needed to be eliminated from the map. Discussion followed, and Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that many items in the Cost Estimate were not included in the narrative. Ms. Coomer suggested that the application narrative should be revised to show a correlation with the Cost Estimate.

Town of Paradise Valley – Sidewalk Construction Project on Tatum Boulevard (Lincoln Drive to Doubletree Ranch Road)

When requesting the next applicant to come forth to present their application, a representative from the Town of Paradise Valley was not in attendance. After further discussion, Co-Chairs Johnson and Beasley indicated that it would be appropriate to let members of the Working Group provide comments or concerns with regard to the applications submitted by the Town of Paradise Valley.

Ms. Dawn Coomer indicated that in Item #10, the application needs to include project details, such as length and width, and whether the project includes landscaping. Ms. Coomer then addressed Item #11 of the application, and noted that the provided responses do not address the question. She noted that the responses need to be itemized and specific. Ms. Coomer also addressed the provision of cost estimates, and stated that the Town did not include the necessary Cost Estimate form provided by ADOT, and that this needs to be changed prior to finalizing and submitting the project. Also, it was noted that the project

location maps are not very useful, and need to be changed in order to provide better project clarification. There were also questions from the Working Group as to why sidewalks were only on one side of the street, and also questions pertaining to the six-foot width. Mr. Larry Shobe noted the applicant may want to show transit stops, and stated the Town should reconsider their proposal to include sidewalks on both sides of the street. Mr. Robert Shultz stated that the application did not provide a good indication as to how many users would be using the facilities upon their completion.

Town of Paradise Valley – Lincoln Drive Sidewalk Construction Project (Invergordon Road to the Town’s East Limit

In the absence of a representative from Paradise Valley, the Working Group addressed the next application to be heard. Ms. Angela Dye stated that the comments toward the first application could realistically be applied to the second application. The Working Group stated that there needed to be more specific project detail in Item #10 of the application, and that Item #11 should be divided in an effort to address each component of the question. It was stated that the Town needs to use the Cost Estimate form provided by ADOT, and that the cost estimates as provided were essentially unacceptable. Also, there was serious concern over the use of off-duty police officers in the budget, and the Town needed to take this item out. Also, the maps are confusing and do not provide any specific details to spatially display the parameters of the project to the reader.

City of Tempe - Tempe Crosscut Canal Multi-Use Path Phase II

Eric Iwersen addressed the Working Group and called their attention to an aerial photo of the project area. Mr. Iwersen said that the project involved the a one-mile non-motorized multi-use path that follows the Salt River Project’s (SRP) Crosscut Canal and portions of Papago Park, and connects Tempe’s Canal and Mouer Parks. Mr. Iwersen noted that this is Phase II of the award-winning Phase I project, which involved a 1.25 mile pathway - represented on the aerial and in the application by a red line. He stated that the proposed project is a re-submittal from last year, and that the project would complete an existing gap in the 11-mile regional Papago Salado Loop. He stated that the pathway follows the canal, and involves a paved path facility, lighting, landscaping, a public art element, and also involves the construction of three bridges along certain segments of the canal. He stated that the project provides connectivity between Downtown Tempe, Tempe Town Lake, and neighborhoods in Phoenix, Scottsdale and Tempe. He addressed the fact that there were many stakeholders involved in the project, and that the project is located along a unique riparian ecosystem in a natural setting. Mr. Iwersen then displayed a number of photos taken at locations along the proposed trail. He also noted that the City has held several meetings with SRP, and is working with several neighborhoods in the implementation of the project.

Discussion followed, and Ms. Dawn Coomer asked a question pertaining to the width of the proposed pathway. Mr. Iwersen confirmed that it would be a minimum of 10-feet wide, and that the calculations in the cost estimate were based on this distance. However, Mr. Iwersen noted that the City of Tempe is still working with several neighborhoods and stakeholders,

and that when the process is complete, the width could potentially be 12 feet, but is anticipated to stay at 10 feet.

Maricopa County - Cycle to the Salt Bicycle Lane Project

Ms. Cristina Herrera of Maricopa County addressed the Working Group, and Ms. Peggy Rubach, also of Maricopa County, distributed copies of several handouts to members in attendance. The handouts consisted of Ms. Herrera's presentation to the Working Group, and a list of partners supporting the effort to complete the project. Ms. Rubach stated that after the presentation, there would be a number of public representatives speaking on behalf of the project.

Ms. Herrera displayed a map of the proposed project area, and stated that the Cycle to the Salt Bicycle Lane Project was the third segment of a larger, three-phase effort to add connectivity for regional bicycle lanes. Ms. Herrera informed the Working Group that Maricopa County obtained Transportation Enhancement funds during Round IV (1996) to construct the 5.8-mile MC Bike Plan Route 75 (extending from the City of Mesa municipal boundary to Usery Pass Road), and during Round V (1997) to construct the six-mile MC Bike Plan Route 77 along Usery Pass Road to the junction of the Bush Highway. She said that this particular project request calls for the development of a 4.6-mile segment, which would link the existing routes at the intersection of Bush Highway and Usery Path Road in the west, to the recreational areas of the Salt River, located to the east. The Salt River Recreational Area offers such amenities as boating, camping and picnicking, fishing, hiking and trail riding, recreational shooting and sightseeing, and is also located in the Tonto National Forest, which is the 5th largest forest in the country.

Ms. Herrera said that the 4.6 mile project would enhance the existing scenic road; create a smoother, wider and clearer road for all users; improve the route for the thousands of bike racers and cyclists sharing the road; and would also benefit over one million users who travel the road on an annual basis. Ms. Herrera stated that at present, the road is a narrow, two lane facility that winds across the topography and contains 19 horizontal and 28 vertical roads. She said that it has graded shoulders with a varying cross slope, and has very limited site distances which contribute to a number of safety concerns. She displayed a series of maps and photos showing the bike lane project, and then highlighted a number of economic and community impacts that the project would have on the surrounding area. She summarized her presentation by displaying a list of non-financial partners who are in support of the project.

Following Ms. Herrera's presentation, Co-Chair Johnson announced a number of individuals from the public that would be expressing their support for the project. Co-Chair Johnson announced that he had received a Request to Speak card from Mr. Arthur Wirtz of the Tonto National Forest. Mr. Wirtz then addressed the Working Group, and noted that Tonto National Forest is one of the most heavily utilized parks in the nation, and that the proposed project would be of significant benefit to enhancing recreational activities and contributing to the regional economy. Mr. Wirtz noted that the proposed application from Maricopa

County was consistent with all planning objectives and policies of the U.S. National Forest Service. Following Mr. Wirtz's short presentation, Mr. Art MacFarland, Mr. Marty Long, and Mr. Gerard Prosnier all spoke on behalf of the project, and wanted to go on record as supporting Maricopa County's application submittal.

Discussion followed, and Mr. Larry Shobe had several questions pertaining to the five foot shoulder on the sides of the road, and wanted to obtain clarification on what was being done to protect pedestrians. He suggested that the County may want to include a cross-section of the roadway in the application to provide further detail. Mr. Doug Kupel also noted that it would be of benefit if the project could also be supported by the Arizona Office of Tourism.

Arizona State University/City of Mesa - Backus Mall, ASU Polytechnic Campus

Mr. Scott Cisson addressed the Working Group, and informed those in attendance that Arizona State University (ASU) Polytechnic received a MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Grant for the Backus Mall project. Mr. Cisson stated that the project is located on the old Williams Gateway Air Force base, and involves the conversion of an old military road into a pedestrian walkway for the ASU Polytechnic Campus. He noted that Phase I involves a 495-foot long, 250-foot wide roadway that includes seating areas, landscaping, and facilities that contain ADA features to ensure handicapped access and mobility. He noted that the project provides connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists to transit hubs; other areas of the campus; surrounding businesses; nearby residential neighborhoods; and provides access to major arterial roadways in the area. Mr. Cisson also stressed the safety elements associated with the project, and how bikes and pedestrian access would be separated.

Mr. Doug Kupel then asked for clarification on a number of issues associated with the application. Mr. Kupel said that on Page Four of the application it states that the project would service 4,000 students, with the potential to service up to 15,000 in a 10 to 15-year period. On Page Six of the application, Mr. Kupel states that the application suggests that the current student population is 6,000, and that it is expected to surpass 20,000 in the next 10 to 15 years. He suggested that these two numbers need to be the same. Mr. Kupel also stated that in Item # 16.a, located on Page Five of the application, the word "refuse" should be stated as "refuge." Discussion followed, and several members pointed out the project maps and several photos, and noticed that they pertain to "Twining Mall," opposed to "Backus Mall." They suggested that the references should be changed to provide for consistency throughout the application.

Ms. Dawn Coomer addressed Item #11.g of the application, and asked Mr. Cisson whether the project was required to obtain an environmental clearance. Ms. Coomer stated that all federal projects needed to go through a federal environmental review process. Mr. Cisson said that he will check on this item, but believes that it does not have to go through a clearance process. Mr. Cisson then addressed a number of questions pertaining to ADA accessibility, and connectivity into campus transit hubs located adjacent to the proposed walkway. Ms. Coomer stated that Transportation Enhancement funds cannot be used on projects that are currently under construction, and said the maps in the appendix of the

application state that Phase I is under construction. She recommended updating those maps to accurately reflect the current status. Ms. Coomer stated that the labeling on the graphics was somewhat confusing, and that they should be re-labeled to reflect this particular application submittal. Ms. Angela Dye suggested that the project also needs to show other partners in the application process that are in support of Backus Mall. Mr. Robert Schultz then asked Mr. Cisson about artist design incorporation, and asked whether this component of the project would be funded through Arizona State University or the City of Mesa. Mr. Cisson stated that it would be completed through Arizona State University.

City of Avondale - Littleton Elementary School Sidewalk Connection Project

Ms. Janeen Gaskins addressed the Working Group, and distributed a brochure on the Littleton Elementary School Sidewalk Connection Project to members in attendance. Ms. Gaskins stated that the project received a MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Grant, and that the project calls for the construction of a six-foot wide sidewalk along the northern boundary of the school on Buckeye Road (MC 85). Ms. Gaskins said that the sidewalk project would be 1,300 feet long and contain a buffer. She displayed several maps of the proposed site. Ms. Gaskins informed the Working Group that the project is located in a low-to-moderate income area, and would provide safe access for school children. She also said that it would provide much needed connectivity to adjacent commercial, recreational and residential areas. It also provides a pedestrian linkage to the City Hall complex.

Ms. Angela Dye stated that it was a relatively small request for funding, and suggested that an eight-foot sidewalk would be more appropriate for the project site. She asked Ms. Gaskins to seriously consider changing the project. Mr. Larry Shobe inquired about pedestrian lighting, and Ms. Gaskins stated that she had not considered it, primarily due to the fact that MC 85 has a significant amount of light coming from the street. After further discussion, Ms. Dawn Coomer addressed Ms. Gaskins and the Working Group with several comments. Ms. Coomer suggested that the applicant go back over the application in an effort to reduce the number of pages down to a number under the 20-page requirement. She also addressed Item #10, and noted that the reference to 13,000 linear feet should in fact be 1,300 linear feet. Ms. Coomer then addressed application Item #11.g, and stated that the ADOT environmental process takes anywhere from 18 to 24 months to complete, and felt that the referenced 6 month period may not be possible. Ms. Coomer addressed Item #16 in the application packet, and stated that the narrative was missing sentences that clearly support the linkages that the site will provide to surrounding areas. She suggested that this sort of narrative could also be used in Item #10 of the application as well.

City of Avondale - Las Ligas Sidewalk Project

Ms. Janeen Gaskins addressed the Working Group, and distributed a brochure on the Las Ligas Sidewalk Project to members in attendance. Ms. Gaskins stated that originally, the residents of the neighborhood were against the project because they thought that the sidewalks would take part of their property. However, Ms. Gaskins indicated that after a community education process, a new survey indicated that there was overwhelming support

for the project by residents of the neighborhood. She stated that at present, the Las Ligas neighborhood contained gaps in the neighborhood sidewalk system. Ms. Gaskins said that Las Ligas project proposes to use transportation enhancement funds for the construction of 7,500 linear feet of sidewalk in a low-to-moderate residential neighborhood, and provide continuous links to encourage pedestrian mobility.

Ms. Angela Dye stated that the maps in the application were unclear as to what was actually being proposed, and suggested that the maps be simplified in order to show where the gaps are, and where new construction will occur. Ms. Dye asked Ms. Gaskins what the sidewalk width would be in the area, and whether the City intended to provide sidewalks on both sides of the cul-de-sac. Ms. Gaskins informed the Working Group that the planned width for the sidewalks in the area was four feet, and that the city planned to place sidewalks around the cul-de-sac. Discussion followed, and Ms. Dye suggested that the city consider the construction of six-foot sidewalks, and questioned paving a sidewalk on a closed cul-de-sac, where pedestrian traffic is extremely low. Mr. Doug Kupel went on to explain that ADA regulations require two ramps per corner, and that adding additional ramps may increase the cost of the overall project. Because the City of Avondale was submitting two project proposals, Co-Chair Johnson asked Ms. Gaskins what the order of priority would be on them. Ms. Gaskins stated that the Littleton Elementary School was the city's first priority, followed by the Las Ligas project.

City of Chandler - Chandler Boulevard/Loop 101 Corridor Bicycle Lane Extension

Ms. Melinda Brimhall addressed the Working Group and noted that the project was a re-submittal from last year. Ms. Brimhall stated that the proposed project would extend the bike lanes along Chandler Boulevard through the Loop 101 Corridor (Price Freeway), and that the project included modifications to medians and curb cuts in order to allow for continuous bicycle lanes. Ms. Brimhall noted that the project was submitted for consideration as a State project. She informed members of the Working Group that the bike lanes currently end just east and west of the intersection along Chandler Boulevard. Ms. Brimhall displayed photos of westbound and eastbound lanes, and displayed a map of the project site. She also highlighted overall dollar estimates and addressed project elements pertaining to the modification of medians; the modification of outside curb lanes; ADA ramps; the relocation of signal poles; and the restoration of landscaping.

Discussion followed, and Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that the maps at the back of the application made it look like the majority of the project is currently located outside of the State right-of-way, which would in fact make it a Local project. Mr. Hall provided a brief overview of last year's submittal of this project for the City of Chandler, and stated that ADOT moved the project from the State Funding Category over to the Local Funding Category because of this same issue. Co-Chair Johnson asked Ms. Brimhall if there were any changes in the project from last year. She said that there were some minor narrative revisions, but that the project site map did not change. Mr. Larry Shobe indicated that the right-of-way was not shown on the map, and depending upon where the lines are, it is hard to tell what category it would belong to for funding purposes. Mr. Bill Lazenby stated that

this is the type of project that should have originally been included with the freeway when this segment of the Loop 101 was constructed. Mr. Doug Kupel said that Item #10 of the application should contain information on the length of the bicycle lanes. Discussion followed, and Co-Chair Johnson told Ms. Brimhall that the Working Group would need some clarification as to whether the project would be submitted for funding consideration under the State or Local project categories.

City of Chandler - Paseo Trail/Park and Ride Multi-Use Path

Ms. Melinda Brimhall addressed the Working Group and informed those in attendance that the project would be submitted under the Local Funding Category. Ms. Brimhall stated that the Transportation Enhancement funds would be used to construct a half-mile multi-use path that connects a new park and ride facility on the west side of Tumbleweed Park, to the Paseo Trail, located to the east. Ms. Brimhall provided photos showing views of the Tumbleweed Park entrance and the Paseo Trail multi-use path. She also displayed a map of the project area, in addition to a site map of Tumbleweed Park. Ms. Brimhall provided an overview of the project elements, and stated that the proposed application calls for design and construction of the half-mile, concrete multi-use path through Tumbleweed Park; the provision of landscaping; bike lockers, benches and drinking fountains; and signage.

Ms. Angela Dye asked Ms. Brimhall for clarification on the project. Ms. Dye noted that the map of the project area shows the general alignment, but wanted to know if the park had been constructed. Ms. Brimhall said the park was there. Ms. Dye suggested that the City talk about other improvements in the park, and stated that Chandler needed to make a stronger case for connectivity, and how the project works into the existing transportation system. Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that if the City of Chandler primarily views this as a bicycle path through a park, then it has very little chance of being funded. Ms. Coomer stated that it looked like a park project for recreational purposes and not a transportation project, and that the project lacked supporting narrative in the application which detailed the connection of the facility to the surface transportation system. Discussion followed, and Mr. Larry Shobe also noted that the width of the pathway needed to be included in the narrative of the application. Mr. Doug Kupel commented on the letters of support between the two Chandler projects, and suggested that the letters be separated out based upon their relevance to each project, instead of including the same letters of support for each project. Mr. Bill Lazenby addressed Item #10 of the application, and stated that the narrative needed to be changed, because it looks like a recreational project and not a transportation project.

City of Glendale - Grand Avenue/Pedestrian Bridge Project

Ms. Paula Moloff addressed the Working Group, and introduced Mr. Jeff Sherman, who was in attendance to provide answers and information regarding specific technical questions. Ms. Paula Moloff also introduced Mr. Tim Quinn, who was in attendance to provide support for issues pertaining to landscape architecture. Ms. Moloff provided a brief overview of the project, and stated that the proposed project consisted of removing 3,600 linear feet of four-foot wide sidewalk, and installing a multi-use path on the north side of West Glendale

Avenue from North 59th Avenue to North 63rd Avenue. Ms. Moloff stated that the project will create a linkage between the new Grand Avenue overpass, which is scheduled for completion in 2006, and businesses, restaurants, neighborhoods, and Glendale High School, which are located along West Glendale Avenue. She provided an overview of the configuration of the intersection at West Glendale Avenue, Grand Avenue and 59th Avenue. She provided information on how the six-way intersection has served as a barrier for many years, and how the bridge will ultimately take care of the north-south alignment and encourage east-west pedestrian movement to the High School and downtown Glendale. Ms. Moloff noted that they were in the process of developing a new High School Stadium for track and field, and that Glendale is expecting more pedestrian traffic. She stressed the importance of upgrading safety amenities for students, and providing an ADA accessible area for wheelchairs and elderly mobility.

Mr. Doug Kupel stated that the maps and graphics were a little confusing and needed some clarification. He asked Ms. Moloff if Grand Avenue was an underpass, as it appeared as such in the graphics. Mr. Kupel also noted that the directions in the graphics were confusing and said that it may be useful to place a directional arrow on them. Mr. Bill Lazenby had several questions about the bridge, specifically pertaining to traffic issues affiliated with how to access, and exit the bridge.

Ms. Dawn Coomer suggested that the City use a sidewalk proposal instead of a multi-use path. She stated that a 10 to 14- foot sidewalk would be justified in the area. Ms. Angela Dye commented on the bridge graphic, and stated that it was very confusing and gave the impression that it was part of the funding request. She stated that the city may want to fix the graphics, and specifically focus on what is actually being requested. Ms. Moloff said that the city would work to improve the graphics, to make them easier to understand. Discussion followed on brick pavers, and the concept of dry pack technology that will be used at the project site. Ms. Moloff concluded by highlighting the economic improvements that would occur as a result of the project's completion, and she also stressed the beneficial impacts that the improvements would have on safety and mobility in the area.

Town of Cave Creek - Town Core Pedestrian Pathway (The Walk)

Mr. Ian Cordwell addressed the Working Group, and informed those in attendance that this was the fourth time that the Town of Cave Creek has submitted an application for this particular project. Mr. Cordwell stated that the project involves the construction of a three-quarter mile path through the commercial district of downtown Cave Creek. Mr. Cordwell noted a drainage study that had been completed downtown, in addition to a traffic study. He stated that the path was six feet in width, and that the project also features landscaping and integral color aggregate paths, that are also ADA accessible. Mr. Cordwell presented a map of the Cave Creek Streetscape to the Working Group, and said that the project boundaries would extend from Viola Lane to the east, and Hidden Valley Road to the west. He also addressed the concept of creating buffers between vehicles and pedestrians.

Mr. Larry Shobe asked Mr. Cordwell if there were any drainage issues to consider, and Mr. Cordwell stated that the Town would develop the pathway in conjunction with retention areas, which would divert water from the pathway system. Mr. Shobe stated that the lack of curbs could potentially pose serious drainage issues. Mr. Cordwell said that the curbs in the area were flush with the ground, and that the lack of curbs did not necessarily present an issue to the Town. Ms. Dawn Coomer stated that the Cost Estimate identifies the installation of lighting as part of the project, but that it was not included in the narrative under Item #10 of the application, or in other areas of narrative. Mr. Cordwell said that he would address issues pertaining to lighting and drainage.

Arizona State University - University District Right-of-Way

Mr. Patrick Panetta addressed the Working Group, and provided a brief overview of the University District right-of-way improvements. Mr. Panetta said that he was attending in the place of Steve Nielsen. Mr. Panetta informed the Working Group that development toward Arizona State University (ASU) Downtown is starting to advance. He noted that there are 2,500 students planned for downtown by Fall of 2006, which will increase to approximately 7,500 students by 2008. He said that the current infrastructure on the site is not able to handle those kind of pedestrian and cycling levels. Mr. Panetta stated that the project will consist of 940 linear feet of pathway, approximately 16 feet in width. He also noted that the project would contain landscaping, lighting, signage and banners. Discussion followed, and Co-Chair Johnson then acknowledged Diana Nakagawa from the City of Phoenix, who expressed her support for the project.

Ms. Angela Dye asked Mr. Panetta for clarification on the location of the project, and Mr. Panetta stated that the project area included frontage along the east side of Central Avenue, and on the south side of Fillmore between Central and 1st Street. Ms. Dye said that there appeared to be issues with students from the light rail station to the ASU Downtown Campus. She also asked about transit services in the area, and Mr. Panetta said that they were not sure about the placement of buses in the district at this particular time. There were additional questions pertaining to the aerial photos in the application, and project scoping. It was also suggested that the University have a member of Phoenix staff look at the cost estimate on the project. Mr. Doug Kupel addressed the Working Group, and stated that he was not sure how viable Exhibit B was to the project's cause. He asked what it had to do with the project. Mr. Kupel recommended that the applicant drop Exhibit B. Mr. Panetta responded by saying that he wanted to show that there was a commitment. Comments were also made regarding the City Council Agenda item that was included in the application. Ms. Dye stated that some of the elements in the Agenda were important, but should have been included in the narrative.

7. Other Items Relevant to the Round XIII and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

Co-Chair Johnson addressed the next order of business, and asked whether anyone had any other issues to raise for discussion. Mr. Ken Hall addressed the Working Group, and stated

that he had received several comments from applicants regarding the issue of utilizing PowerPoint presentations when presenting their projects before the Working Group. Mr. Hall stated that some applicants felt that the use of PowerPoint presentations may be unfair, and could potentially create an overall bias toward certain projects that were graphically displayed better than others. He noted that some applicants used them, while others did not. He wanted to know what the consensus of the Working Group was with regard to allowing PowerPoint presentations from applicants at future review meetings.

Co-Chair Johnson acknowledged the concern, and asked to go around the table in an effort to collectively obtain input from the Working Group. Ms. Angela Dye felt that there was not an advantage or disadvantage associated with either using or not using PowerPoint. She did not object to these types of presentations being used, and noted that some graphics were actually easier to view on the screen, opposed to reviewing them on a standard page within the application. Mr. Robert Schultz said that he did not have objections, and felt that PowerPoint provided further clarification. Mr. Bill Lazenby said that applicants should use it if they have the chance, while Mr. Larry Shobe said that applicants needed to make PowerPoint relevant, opposed to just copying items verbatim out of the application. Co-Chair Johnson stated that the consensus was unanimous, and while not required, he suggested that PowerPoint presentations should continue to be used if applicants feel comfortable with presenting in this manner. Co-Chair Johnson stated that he would like to see applicants hand out copies of their presentations in the future.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Co-Chair Johnson stated that the next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held Thursday, June 23, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in the MAG Cholla Room. Co-Chair Johnson stated that the purpose of this meeting is to rank transportation enhancement fund applications. As a reminder for applicants, Co-Chair Johnson noted that responses heard at today's meeting are due to MAG staff by Monday, June 20th at Noon. He noted that MAG staff will work on compiling our comments made at the meeting today and send them to applicants as soon as possible. Co-Chair Johnson stated that if needed, a tentative meeting may be held on June 28, 2005. However, he stated that he would like to see everything completed by the June 23rd meeting, and not have the June 28th meeting. There being no further comments or questions, Co-Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 12:17 p.m.